

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/750,640	0,640 12/28/2000		Duane Scott Dewald	TI-30205	6977		
23494	7590	12/17/2002	·				
		ENTS INCORPO	EXAMINER				
P O BOX 65	•		ROBINSON, MARK A				
DALLAS, T	A 73203			, and the second			
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				2872			
				DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002	!		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/750,640	DEWALD, DUANE	SCOTT
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark A. Robinson	2872	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic) a timely filed amendment whi al (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper rep ch places the appli	ply to a cation in
_	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THIS on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 36(a) and the appropriate extending the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ms.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7,10-13 and 15-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8,9,14 and	<u>21-30</u> .		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exan	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	•	MARK A. HOB PRIMARY EXA	- INSON WINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant is now arguing that the entrance surface of Kaplan is not a "mirrored entrance aperture" as set forth in the claims. However, according to the definitions of "mirror" provided by applicant, the surface of Kaplan in question satisfies the broad definition of "mirror" as it is a highly reflective surface.